

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated July 17, 2009, the Assignee respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4-7, 17-20, 23, and 25-34 are pending in this application.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Office indicates that claims 17-20 and 23-34 would be allowable if certain § 112 rejections are overcome. The Assignee believes the § 112 rejections are cured, and Examiner Parry is thanked for the indication of allowability.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office rejected claims 17-20 and 23-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Independent claims 17 and 26 have been amended, so the Office is respectfully requested to re-examine these claims in their current presentation.

Rejection of Claims 1 & 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Office rejected claims 1 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,889,385 to Rakib, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0192053 to Sheppard, *et al.*, further in view of U.S. Patent 6,839,902 to Hirota, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2008/0184306 to Ellis, *et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,233,389 to Barton, *et al.*

Claims 1 and 4-7, however, cannot be obvious over the proposed combination of *Rakib*, *Sheppard*, *Hirota*, *Ellis*, and *Barton*. These claims recite, or incorporate, features that are not

taught or suggested by *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites “a plurality of tuners and demodulators with each tuner and demodulator having an output connected to the system data bus and connected to an analog-to-digital converter” (emphasis added). Support may be found at least in FIG. 6.

These features are not taught or suggested by *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton*. The proposed combination of *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton* teaches a single digital tuner 780 connected to a “QSPK DEMOD” 820, with three other tuners 700, 702, and 704 connected to an “A/D MATRIX” 730 (see *Rakib’s* FIG. 7A). Only the tuner 700 is connected to *Rakib’s* reference numeral 756, which the Office interprets as equivalent to the claimed “system data bus.” While *Rakib’s* reference numeral 756 is a bus, *Rakib* explains that bus 756 sends data from CPU 728 to the tuner 700. See U.S. Patent 6,889,385 to *Rakib, et al.* at column 33, lines 24-25 and lines 32-35. The proposed combination of *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton*, then, does not teach or suggest “a plurality of tuners and demodulators with each tuner and demodulator having an output connected to the system data bus and connected to an analog-to-digital converter” (emphasis added). One of ordinary skill in the art would not think that independent claim 1 is obvious.

Claims 1 and 4-7, then, are not obvious over *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton*. Independent claim 1 recites features that are not disclosed or suggested by *Rakib, Sheppard, Hirota, Ellis, and Barton*. The dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. Claims 1 and 4-7, then, cannot be obvious, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

If any issues remain outstanding, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or scott@scottzimmerman.com.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "S. P. Zimmerman", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 41,390